



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,098	03/15/2004	Robert S. Melesko	033327.0017	9262

7590 07/02/2009
Thomas F. Bergert
Williams Mullen, PC
Suite 700
8270 Greensboro Drive
McLean, VA 22102

EXAMINER

MCCULLOCH JR, WILLIAM H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3714

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/02/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to amendments received 3/30/2009. Claims 1-6, 8-19, and 21-31 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 14, and 27-31 currently amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-6, 8-19, 21-26, 28-29, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 6,267,670 to Walker et al. (hereinafter Walker).

Regarding claims 1, 14, 28, and 29, Walker teaches a transaction processing device and method for conducting a lottery comprising:

- A first POS terminal (POS terminal 30) having a CPU (CPU 31) and a display (display device 31; see at least fig. 3);
- A network (e.g., the Internet; see at least 5:24-35) facilitating electronic communications between the first POS terminal, a lottery management and transaction processing system (e.g., lottery data processing system 60), and one or more third party application providers (the Examiner notes that this limitation does not require a third party application provider, but rather a network facilitating connection to one or more providers—the Internet connection described by Walker meets such a limitation);

Art Unit: 3714

- Wherein the lottery management and transaction processing system includes a gaming platform services layer hosting a plurality of available lottery games selectable by a user of the first POS terminal (It is noted that the recited “gaming platform services layer” is not a physical component, but rather a logical data abstraction performing a particular function. The function of “hosting a plurality of available lottery games selectable by a user of the first POS terminal is taught by Walker in at least 6:24-31),
- And wherein the gaming platform services layer is in communication with an application layer that can receive at least one third party game application which can be selected by a user of the first POS terminal (It is noted that the recited “application layer” is not a physical component, but rather a logical data abstraction performing a particular function. The function of receiving "at least one third party game application which can be selected by a user of the first POS terminal" is taught by Walker in at least 6:24-31);
- Retailer software operable by said CPU for displaying a first interface associated with at least one non-lottery-related retailer function on said first POS terminal display (e.g., purchase of groceries; see at least 6:24-31 and Fig. 9); and
- Lottery software operable by said CPU for displaying a second interface associated with at least one lottery-related retailer function on said first display (see at least 6:24-31), and wherein the second interface allows

selection, by a user of the first POS terminal, of a game offering hosted by the gaming platform service layer (see at least 6:24-31).

Further regarding claims 1, 14, 28, and 29, because Walker's invention includes modification of existing equipment, the Examiner interprets Walker's software as a "third party" application because neither the customer nor the grocery store is a party to Walker. Finally, the third party application is provided via the network at least because it requires communication between the POS terminals 30 and other controllers and/or servers discussed above.

Regarding claim 31, the Examiner interprets a "self-service, browser-based point-of-sale device" as Walker's POS terminal 30 since "self-service" is functional language and its structure is capable of use by any individual. Furthermore, if a cashier or clerk wishes to purchase tickets in the system of Walker, it is clear that he could operate a POS terminal to make such a purchase. There is no demonstrable structural difference between the terminal of the claimed invention and that of Walker.

Further regarding claims 1, 14, 28, 29, and 31, Walker teaches the invention substantially as described above including the teaching of a third party application provider and wherein a number of games include third-party game applications provided from the third party application provider. Walker lacks in explicitly teaching *more than one* third party application provider. Regardless, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to allow additional third party providers to contribute games to the system of Walker, in order to provide the player with a greater variety of different games from which to choose. One of ordinary skill in the art is

Art Unit: 3714

presumed to have skills apart from what the prior art references expressly disclose. *In re Sovish*, 769 F.2d 738, 743 (Fed. Cir. 1985). A person of ordinary skill is also a person of ordinary creativity, not an automaton. *KSR*, 127 S.Ct. at 1742. Furthermore, the *KSR* Court recognized that "[w]hen there is a design need or market pressure to solve a problem and there are a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, a person of ordinary skill in the art has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp." *KSR*, 127 S.Ct. at 1732.

Regarding claims 2, 4, 15 and 17, Walker teaches a first POS terminal provided with memory and both retailer software and lottery software stored in and operable from said memory (see at least 6:24-31).

Regarding claims 3 and 16, Walker teaches wherein said retailer software is stored on a retailer controller in communication with said terminal and operable by said CPU for display on said display device (e.g., in-store servers; see at least 5:1-23 and 5:37-49).

Regarding claims 5-6 and 18-19, Walker teaches lottery software is operable by said CPU for display on said first POS terminal display (e.g. POS terminal 30; see at least 5:1-23), said gaming platform services layer hosts a plurality of available lottery games that are playable by a user of the first POS terminal (see at least 6:24-31), and wherein the second interface allows for game play, by a user interacting with the first POS terminal, of a game offering hosted by the gaming platform services layer (see explanation of claim 1). Claims 6 and 19 state that the game is provided on a *second* POS terminal, as opposed to a *first* POS terminal recited in claims 5 and 18. Walker

Art Unit: 3714

teaches that multiple terminals are provided, each terminal performing substantially identical functions (see at least Fig. 1 and description thereof).

Regarding claims 8 and 21, Walker teaches wherein said second interface displays an interface associated with said selected game upon said selection being communicated to said gaming platform services layer (see at least figs. 8-10 and 8:11-9:9).

Regarding claims 9 and 22, Walker describes lottery software operable for managing lottery transactions and wherein the displayed [lottery-related] interface is taken from the group consisting of: lottery ticket purchase, validation, and game result query (see at least 6:24-31 and 11:29-45).

Regarding claims 10 and 23, Walker teaches a lottery management and transaction processing system facilitates processing of lottery transactions with a remote lottery host system (e.g., the lottery data processing system 60 which may be remote from the POS terminals).

Regarding claims 11 and 24, Walker teaches lottery tickets including a quick pick ticket and a draw ticket (see at least 9:44-49).

Regarding claims 12 and 25, Walker shows the POS terminal in operating communication with a printing device (e.g., printer 39).

Regarding claims 13 and 26, the Examiner interprets the recited “web browser” as a software application that enables a user to display information located on the Internet or a computer network. Since Walker describes an interface that displays

Art Unit: 3714

information on a computer network (see at least 4:59-67), Walker meets the claimed limitation of an interface displayed via a web browser.

4. Claims 27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker in view of U.S. 2002/0062253 to Dosh, Jr. et al. (hereinafter Dosh).

Regarding claim 27, Walker teaches a system for processing lottery transactions substantially as described above. Regarding claim 30, Walker describes a lottery system as detailed above and further teaches a plurality of distributor server systems (e.g. POS controllers 20 or in-store servers), each having at least one browser-based point-of-sale device (POS terminal 30; see explanation of “web browser” in relation to claims 13 and 26) for processing lottery and non-lottery transactions, said distributor server systems being in operable communication with said network (see at least fig. 1 and 6:47-57).

Walker teaches the invention substantially as described above, but lacks in explicitly teaching a transaction handler for managing data exchange and communications with at least one third party application. In a related disclosure, Dosh teaches a Transaction Handler 16 software component that receives requests from the POS terminals 12 to upload loyalty transactions from the POS terminals 12 to a database (see at least paragraph 115). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the invention of Walker to include the transaction handler software of Dosh in order to provide a secure means of communication between third party software (e.g., Dosh’s player loyalty program) and existing POS software, as is favorably described by Dosh.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 3/30/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's sole argument is found on page 13 of the Remarks section, which states that Walker does not teach "a plurality of third party application providers providing lottery game applications by a network as claimed in [c]laim 1." The Examiner notes that while Walker teaches a third party application provider wherein a number of games include third-party game applications provided from the third party application provider, Walker lacks in explicitly teaching *more than one* third party application provider.

Regardless, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to allow additional third party providers to contribute games to the system of Walker, in order to provide the player with a greater variety of different games from which to choose. One of ordinary skill in the art is presumed to have skills apart from what the prior art references expressly disclose. *In re Sovish*, 769 F.2d 738, 743 (Fed. Cir. 1985). A person of ordinary skill is also a person of ordinary creativity, not an automaton. *KSR*, 127 S.Ct. at 1742. Furthermore, the *KSR* Court recognized that "[w]hen there is a design need or market pressure to solve a problem and there are a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, a person of ordinary skill in the art has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp." *KSR*, 127 S.Ct. at 1732. Therefore, Applicant's argument is not persuasive to demonstrate patentability over the cited prior art.

Though it is not strictly required for the grounds of rejection contained herein, it should be noted that in apparatus and system claims, the recitations of “third party applications” and “third party application providers” do not impart any structural limitations that would distinguish over applications and application providers that were not explicitly described as “third party.” In other words, there is no patentable structural difference between an application produced and supplied by Walker versus one produced and supplied from any one else.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3714

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William H. McCulloch whose telephone number is (571) 272-2818. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (571) 272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/W. H. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 3714
7/1/2009

/Peter D. Vo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714